



*copy*

ROTATION

NOTE: Attached pages 1-11, incl., were excerpted from transcript of 24th Meeting of CIA CSB, 5 March 1954, because of references to ROTATION.

See, also:

22nd Meeting - 18 Feb 1954 - pp. 13-18, incl.

23rd Meeting - 25 Feb 1954 - pp. 1-8, incl. & pp. 10-18, incl.

SECRET

. . . The 24th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 5 March 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We will come to order, gentlemen. The first item on the agenda is the minutes of the last meeting. Are there any desired corrections or changes?

I have none.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If not, we will consider them approved as submitted.

Item 2 on the agenda returns us to the principal item of last week's Career Service Board meeting, the Selective Rotation Program, prepared by the Office of Personnel. You will find before you a memorandum entitled "Proposed Rotation Programs for Junior Professional Personnel", which is being submitted as an alternate proposal by the DD/A. Is that correct, Red?

(Following is the paper referred to above)

PROPOSED ROTATION PROGRAMS FOR JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL  
(To Be Accomplished Concurrently)

1. Agency Office Orientation Course

- a. The course would be offered annually, and the duration of each course would be approximately one year.
- b. The purpose of the course would be to provide carefully selected junior professional employees with a better understanding of the activities, problems, and inter-relationships of each element of the Agency.
- c. Each Agency office and staff, in its turn, would offer planned instruction and orientation to the trainees, following an approved schedule.
- d. The employees who attend the course would be selected as follows:
  - (1) Course quotas would be assigned to the Agency's Career Service Boards.
  - (2) Each Career Service Board would nominate junior professional employees with that career designation who have the greatest potentiality (nominations would exceed the assigned quota). Each nomination would be accompanied by appropriate justification and the comments of the heads of the organizational components concerned.
  - (3) Final selection of students (observing minimum quotas) would be accomplished by an Agency committee formed for this purpose.
- e. Administrative control of the Agency Office Orientation Course would be a responsibility of the Assistant Director (Personnel).
- f. When necessary, students would be assigned to Career Development Slots while undergoing this training, with the

SECRET

25X1A

SECRET

approval of the CIA Career Service Board.

2. Career Development Plan Rotation Program

- a. Under the provisions of this program, a junior professional employee would perform specified duties or receive training for a fixed period of time in an Agency component other than the one to which assigned. At the conclusion of the rotation training, he would receive an assignment from his Career Service Board in which his increased skills could be used to the greatest benefit of the Agency.
- b. Each such rotation assignment would conform to the individual's career development plan as approved by his Career Service Board and the Agency officer who is advised by the Board.
- c. As a general rule, a rotation assignment under this program would be for more than six months but not to exceed two years.
- d. The Agency's Career Service Boards would have at least a fixed minimum number of employees in such rotation assignment at any given time.
- e. When necessary, Career Development Slots would be used for employees in this program, with the approval of the CIA Career Service Board.

MR. WHITS: Kirk, if I could answer that question you asked me at the last meeting, whether I disagreed with the Personnel plan as outlined, the answer is "yes", and I had a number of reasons why I disagreed with it. I would like to propose this plan not as a finished product, but at least as something closer to what I think we might be shooting at than the plan that was submitted by Personnel last week.

There is only one error in this paper which I have submitted, and that is in paragraph 1.e. It's not a major point, but I question whether the subject program should be under the Office of Personnel. Personally, I believe if we are going to have such a program it should be under the Office of Training and run in conjunction with the Junior Officer Trainee Program. I studied this plan. Some of the things that occurred to me and the reasons why I didn't agree with it, it seemed to me that there was such a wide variety of organizational components and activities in the Agency that these young people would not spend enough time in any one activity to be productive in anything except the simplest task. I also think that with people in that age bracket and grade it would be difficult to maintain their interest and their motivation over a period as long as five years. I rather thought that maybe one year was as long as you could hope to maintain their interest and real motivation. Any individual receiving this training would be rotated over such a wide range of activities, operations, etc.,

SECRET

SECRET

that at the end of this period I think he would be thoroughly familiar with the organization of the Agency and the inter-relationships that exist, but I am not convinced that at the end of that time he would be particularly well qualified, anymore than he was in the beginning, for productive work in any particular component. I rather think that each person is more inclined to develop logically along the lines indicated by his particular ability and his particular temperament and aptitude, motivations, etc., and that this development, particularly at the junior professional level, would be predominantly in a specific area of professional specialty rather than the broad treatment which this other plan proposed.

. . . Mr. Amory joined the Meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Excuse me a second. Does Mr. Amory have a copy of what we are discussing? What we are talking about now is the proposed rotation program for personnel, which the DD/A has presented as a modification of the Office of Personnel's original paper.

MR. WHITE: I think, also, at the end of this rather prolonged period there may be some difficulty in finding an acceptable assignment, because some of these people--theoretically it shouldn't be, but I think practically, if you take a man out of the responsibility of any particular office and rotate him and train him for as long as five years, unless he is a real ball of fire you may have some trouble getting people to welcome him into any particular office. I think we will have some difficulty in evaluating these individuals over such a prolonged period. I think the period is too long, in more ways than one. The cost of putting 120 individuals in this program for three years, the salaries alone would be somewhere in excess of three million dollars. Of course, if we are going to absorb that within the ceiling, which I think we should, that is not a budgetary problem, at least insofar as the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress is concerned. So I rather felt that picking up sort of where [ ] left off here the other day, that he had career plans for a number of his people, but the fulfillment of those career plans was dependent on the other offices in the Agency being willing to take his people and give them the training that he thought they ought to have, and so forth. So I have serious reservations about the effectiveness of a program that lifts these 120 people out from their home base, so to speak, their parent offices, and places them

SECRET

under an entirely independent office for a prolonged period, during which time they would normally expect, I feel sure, to have received promotions along with other people in the Agency, and then finding a suitable place for them at the end of that time. And as I said, I doubt whether or not they can be productive during that training period.

So I believe that something tied closer into the career service plan for an individual as developed by his own Career Service Board wherein the remainder of the Agency components would cooperate in training this individual along the lines that his Career Service Board thought he ought to have, would be a better way to try to tackle this thing.

I also felt that maybe we are trying to run before we learn to walk. Instead of taking 120 people maybe we should start with a much smaller number. I think I have suggested 20 or 25 here to get started with.

So this paper which I have reproduced here--you all have a copy of it--was an attempt to reflect my thoughts as to how I thought this might be better done, at least to start with, than the Personnel proposal. I don't say it is a finished product at all, and I'm not even sure that it represents a complete, finished product of my own thinking, but it's much closer to what I think we ought to try to do than the other paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am in disagreement only on two of the major points you mentioned, Red. One is the presumption that some of the individuals in this program might not have an office to return to, because I think the whole program will be foredoomed to failure if every individual put into it isn't a pretty highly qualified individual whom the office would want very much to have back. In other words, whether we start with 20 or 120, I think they should be the brightest of this group that we look forward to, because we are still, as I understand it, following the principle that these will be potential junior executives once they come out of this.

MR. WHITE: Kirk, I would agree with that if you shortened the period, but I think if you put a grade 7 from the Logistics Office, say, into this program, the Logistics Office would be glad to have him back as a 9, but if you take him for four or five years, to keep him interested he will have to be promoted along with his contemporaries, and he might get up to an 11 or 13 by the time Logistics gets him back.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe one of the reasons why I don't stumble over

SECRET

SECRET

that block is because I have never yet, in my own mind, come to a time period. I wonder whether it is practical to set a time period for a program like this, because it seems to me it might vary with the individuals.

MR. REYNOLDS: As a matter of record, Kirk, I would like to point out to the Board that the paper submitted by the Office of Personnel was substantially that asked for by the Board, and the time element was put in there because people around this table said they thought that sufficient time must be allowed to give an all-round training throughout the Agency in these offices. I just want to point that out, that we did it because we were told to do it, and it was our first shot at the thing. I remember that the time element was discussed as one that would have to cover something in the neighborhood of five years, on the outside, and we said we thought three to five years was giving sufficient elasticity. I personally don't agree with Red's one year. I don't think you could do it in a year.

MR. WHITE: I don't believe you can, and I don't propose that you give a man a year to get him generally oriented, and that is the end. My proposal would be pointed toward giving him certain training for a year, after which he becomes productive for a year or two, and then you give him more training.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the second point of your contention that I disagree with. You stated that if we adopted it for 120, which I think we all agree is a theoretical figure, it would cost the Agency in the neighborhood of three million dollars. I disagree with you rather strongly on that because to my mind the second major criteria for successful operation of this, is that the individuals in it be gainfully employed while they are in the process of rotation. Here we are dealing with personnel who know CIA, we aren't dealing with people we bring in from the outside world who have to go through the whole orientation program to know the Agency and know where their careers lie, we are dealing with known quantities. So it seems to me the maximum acquaintance period would be around three months before they started to pull their weight. And it would be assumed that they were gainfully employed from then on for whatever period they stayed in that office. If not, there would be two faults, one the individuals, and two, the supervisors for not seeing to it they got their money's worth. So I wouldn't say the loss which could be chargeable to training per se, would be anymore than a quarter of the salaries of the individuals.

Going on to Harry's point about one year, it seems to me that the



SECRET

minimum an individual should stay in any one office would be six months and the maximum would be not much more than a year. I have always counseled youngsters and sort of set the pattern for myself, that you ought to give a year to any job to see whether you really don't like it as much as you think you don't like it, or aren't as well qualified for it as you think you should be. Of course, that would vary a lot for individuals. You have to recognize the fact that some of these individuals through the faults of the Career Service Boards, through the faults of the individuals, through the misassessments, etc., are going to get misplaced. Consequently, we would want to move them faster. But generally speaking, six months as the minimum and a year as the maximum, and somewhere in between as the average.

I've been doing a little homework in the nature of auxiliary work because in the inspection of the Office of Training we are in the middle of the JOT program, and I set myself the task of talking to every single JOT and getting his reaction to that program, and then talking to the people who used JOT's and getting their reaction as consumers, and the more I see of that and the more we discuss this, the more this seems to be a projection of that program.

MR. WHITE: I agree.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A projection utilizing individuals already on board rather than going out and getting them. Further, the more I talk to people in that program the more it seems to me that the maximum you can rotate is about three offices and you have rotated the individuals out. If you go beyond that he gets into jobs for which he is not interested and he gets himself so thoroughly spread that he is not good for any one of them.

MR. WHITE: I agree with that.

25X1A [ ] I entirely agree with that, and it appears that some of them have rotated to the point where they begin to wonder what it's all about and when can they get started. They really want a job instead of a succession of little jobs.

25X1A [ ] That is perfectly true. And I agree also that that is an extension of the JOT program. But it was my contention that it would have to take more than a year on the grounds that if you are actually going to have this at the beginning of a career service program, that these men should actually serve and contribute in the places they went - all of this not so much in the interest of training them, necessarily, but in the interest of starting

6  
SECRET

SECRET

a mechanism going here which then would pick up more dirt as we went along and enable us to gradually, throughout the younger group, get an actual, in-fact Career Service Program going.

Now I agree also with the statement that I think 120 is too many to start with. I think we should start smaller, because the idea is to get something started, and when we get it going I think it would pick up dirt as it goes along, if we do it right. And as time goes on and more and more young people come in they will be picked up by this device.

25X1A [ ] You will have a waiting list of young people who want to get into it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not over a long period because presuming we continue the JOT program there would come a period, say in 5 or 10 years from now, when we would have picked up and caught all the junior executives with that potential and caliber in the Agency, and the rest coming in would be coming in through that JOT mechanism.

MR. REYNOLDS: Kirk, I agree that 120 is too many. I think that was just a shot in the dark.

25X1A [ ] These are second thoughts now.

MR. REYNOLDS: The other point which to me differs from the JOT is that we are taking mature men who are in the Agency rather than someone that we picked out of college, or what have you; and, secondly, that our plan is given to the man rather than the man picking his plan. It's a rather more definite plan than the JOT, as I see it. It's not firm, but this thing envisages that you would lay it out pretty carefully. The plan was an element of importance in this other thought that we had.

25X1A [ ] Kirk, I believe in the principle of rotation and the establishment of some mechanism whereby rotation can be controlled, in effect we will have to have some sort of a quota basis. I also think this JOT program is a very useful device if for no other purpose than getting the brighter, younger people and giving them a chance at shaking themselves down in something that they like and are fitted for. But I really question the long-term wisdom of setting up a formalized program of rotation under which you would formally recruit people and tell them, in effect, "Look, you are among God's chosen here, and we are going to give you a chance to really make something of yourselves here." I'm afraid they would all get the idea that they are privileged

SECRET



SECRET

individuals. Such a method would very likely ruin a fair percentage of people you chose for it. I wonder if we can't set up some "God watching the sparrows fall" kind of system here, whereby we can keep an eye on these younger people and assist and encourage their rotation as it seems desirable, without making such a terrific point of it to people themselves.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I couldn't agree with you more. We don't want to spoil the individuals. I think that is the part of general Agency discipline which it is essential to maintain. We don't want to create what [redacted] first called an "elite corps", which everybody agreed sounded an awful lot more like the Schutzstaffel than we wanted to have in CIA. I think the reason, John, that we started out at this--just following the train of thought back--was because the Board seemed to generally agree that rotation under the present system was more or less hit or miss and a case of job-shopping by the individual or piracy by an office, so that there wasn't a planned rotation. It was either an office going out to grab another man in another office or an individual wanting to change jobs either because he had a yen to get into the covert side or the analytic side, but there was no schematic process about it.

25X1A

Now, following that train of thought, it seems we have suddenly come over to this other corner where we have presented to us a very fine plan but, as you point out, a very firm mechanism or machinery. So it seems what we want to do is probably end up somewhere in the middle of having a guidance system. The thing about Red's paper that appeals to me is that it throws the principal burden on the Career Service Boards, with a supervisory master body to needle, encourage, persuade, and get the mechanism going, which probably should be this Board.

25X1A

[redacted] I think so.

Or a career planning group of this Board that would watch over it continuously.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A sub-group of this Board consisting of three or four members of this Board.

25X1A

[redacted] I was going to propose the very laudible purposes of this plan can be achieved by some device like that.

On the plan itself, I do have the same objection John has, that however you define it, it would become an elite corps. It should be possible to follow the careers of the men without their knowing they are being followed,

SECRET

where they would stick to the jobs they are now doing and as far as they know their purpose is to know that job as well as they can. But if you identify these people in grades, say, 9 to 12, and have a mechanism in this Board for seeing to it that the FER's and the files and any other relevant material is known to this Board, and then judged for both the time of rotation--not arriving at any six months or any other arbitrary figure, but when it becomes appropriate for an individual, and the kind of rotation he should have--so that you are following the careers of the people who are likely to come along and whom you want to foster in the same way this would tend to do, but without any of the apparatus. You also, in that case, would not have to worry about slots or money because every man would have his slot and his salary in the job he was performing as well as was required of him, and better, but you would have a mechanism here for following those hundred or how many people you were interested in developing.

25X1A [ ] And as Red points out in his paper, the Career Development Slots which exist, could be used to supplement and amplify that kind of a program.

25X1A [ ] We are trying to do something like that in a few instances. OCI and ONE have told us the type of people they want in the staff a year or so from now--just a few people--without telling them, and we will give them courses that the Chairman can't describe, and sort of bring them up so that two years from now if he wants them they will be available and trained along the lines he wants them trained. They will also probably be rotated to OCI or ONE for a short period initially. It's just a shot in the dark, but it's the unconscious approach.

25X1A [ ] What breaks the rotation program now is the natural tendency to want to hang on to the good people. But if those people were identified to this Board and followed, that could be done away with in everybody's interest.

25X1A [ ] I am interested in a Career Service System working eventually in such a fashion that a responsible officer will come to his other offices and say: "Gum, I have a hell of a good man here and I think you will profit by including him in your specialty"--whatever it is, and run on a rather gentlemanly sort of basis, rather than everybody trying to hang onto his good people and trying to palm off his bad ones to any sucker who will take them.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, the general consensus seems to be that what we want to end up with, then, is principally establishing a quota of how many should be put into a rotation system, allocating the quota among the major Career Service Boards, laying down the ground rules as to who should be nominated for those quotas, and then this Board sitting on top of the checkers' watch to see that the various reds and blacks are filled and moved.

MR. WHITE: That sounds good to me, Kirk.

MR. AMORY: The exclusive method is not all as black as some people are painting it, and at present from our side and [ ] shop--this is not the exclusive method, this is an additional method. 25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That was determined at the very start, that this was to supplement what is already proceeding at the present time.

MR. AMORY: The only thing I would comment on both papers is the idea that you rotate several times consecutively. I think it is a lot better to look at a 30-year career as a trunk -- a guy rotates out between the second and fourth year and then he comes back to his basic thing for three or five years, and about the time he is getting the idea he is a darn good fellow on that, then he rotates out for another three years, rather than three rotations in his late 20's and then feeling that for the next 20 years he goes to [ ] 25X1C

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That sounds like a rosy career. (Laughter)

I think the next step, then, is to get a statement flushing out more or less what has been described.

[ ] Since the Office of Personnel and the OTR and the DD/A's proposals have been presented, would it be possible for three representatives from those offices to get those papers together and try to synthesize it? 25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, can I ask you and [ ] to work on that? 25X1A

MR. WHITE: Fine.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is good.

Isn't there actually a rotation plan going on within DD/P itself? In our Weekly Report there was an indication from our Placement & Utilization Division that you had one of your own actually working.

[ ] Things are inter-working like that down there but I don't

SECRET

think it's particularly on purpose.

MR. REYNOLDS: This one sounded like it had been working on purpose.

25X1A

[ ] I don't think it is in any formalized form, Harry. I just think it's the result of everybody coming together and realizing that sort of thing has to go on to develop a well-rounded outfit.

MR. REYNOLDS: It came from your Career Service Boards, and I think there were 10 or 15 people being moved around within the DD/P, obviously for further training.

25X1A

[ ] : Chief rotates three at a time to field offices. It's definitely improving. It's picking up sort of a momentum of its own.


25X1A

[ ] We are so much better off than we were two years ago, and we probably don't realize it and we are still probably a couple of jumps ahead of ourselves in our reactions around the Board here. And I think that is good.

SECRET

NOTE: Attached pages 1-8, incl., and 10-18, incl., were excerpted from 23d Meeting of CIA Career Service Board, 25 Feb 1954, because of references made herein to "ROTATION"

25X1A



SECRET

. . . The 23rd Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 25 February 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, shall we come to order?

Item 1 is the minutes of the last meeting. Are there any corrections or changes desired?

25X1A

[ ] They are okay by me.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If not, we will consider them acceptable as presented.

Item 2, we have asked [ ] of the OCD Career Service Board 25X1A to come up and give us a brief presentation on what that Board has been doing in the way of career planning. I think it is fairly obvious to you, gentlemen, from my comments to the Director on career planning, that I consider career planning one of the keystones of a successful career service program.

25X1A

[ ] with that brief introduction, will you give us the word?

25X1A

[ ] Yes, but I really didn't know this was going to be a presentation. I just made some rough notes, and if you will bear with me I will give you my thoughts on the career service program. I trust you won't hold it against me. It's strictly my personal idea.

First, I'd like to say that I think the career service program and the policy and thought that went into the development of this program is very sound. I do feel that the keystone of a career program is the career planning, and I think that that has really bogged down. And the keystones of career planning are rotation and training. I think training--and I'd say this even if you weren't here, Matt--I think training has done an outstanding job. I'm not too sure that we are getting all that we could by not having an adequate plan for each individual as to what training he should take. Rotation is virtually non-existent today.

I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, on that paper of yours on the 26th of January where you pointed out a lot of the accomplishments of the career service program, and when you pointed out many of the shortcomings of the program.

Now here is what we have done in OCD. In OCD we have a board and we include on that board all of our Division Chiefs simply because no one individual knows or can give the board a good background on any individual unless he is in 25X9 that same Division. At least, our Divisions number around [ ] so we have them all sit in. We meet only once a month. We rotated people--we "tried" to rotate people, and it was--as you put down--largely a slave-mart sort of deal.

SECRET



SECRET

Then in September we asked each Division Chief to come up with a career service plan for two or three of his most promising junior executives, the plan to map out what that individual should do over the next ten years in order to become a more competent Agency intelligence officer. We received 24 such plans. We tried, and I say that because that is exactly what we did, we "tried" to put one plan into effect. The gentleman was a graduate of the Junior Officer Training Corps. He has been in OCD almost two years. He now has a plan where he ought to go overseas, 25X1A

[REDACTED]

ment. In other words, this is a 10-year plan. The next step in this plan would be an assignment to the DD/P area.

MR. WISNER: What is the age of this man?

25X1A [REDACTED] 28 to 30 years old, in round numbers. That is about right.

25X1A [REDACTED]

MR. WISNER: And his grade?

25X1A [REDACTED] Either a 9 or an 11.

What we have attempted to do for the past five months was to get one of the DD/P boards to assume this man for an eventual assignment overseas, we had hoped. He would be carried on, we hope, a Career Development Slot. We would be responsible for the man and for his reassignment when he came back. He would be an extra number, as it were, wherever he were sent. So far we really haven't made too much headway.

And now I will tell you why we have him, and I will tell you what I think is wrong with the present setup. I don't think that 25 boards, or 20 boards or so, are too many; for instance, our board is responsible now for [REDACTED] I don't think that a board can handle more than that. I don't think a board could handle more than [REDACTED] people if they are going to do an effective job. But all of these boards have been operating independently. They haven't had what I term an "administrative chain of command." There has not been established the echelons through which we could go for operating action. This Board here does fine in giving and setting policy, but there is no cohesion between the existing 25 boards. There is no way where somebody could take action and tell the FI Board: "Yes, you will take this man as an extra number," or tell my board that I will absorb so and so, and so and so, over the next year or two years. Now I think that

25X9

SECRET

SECRET

that could be licked by retaining most of your present boards but then by establishing higher boards; in other words, in the DD/I area I believe there should be a board consisting of the chairmen of all of the DD/I office boards, and I would serve on that board and Joe would serve on it, and the head man from OSI and the head man from ORR. Then I would go to that board with actions that I want taken, not policies. "I want John Smith to get a tour in OOC." Therefore, if the OCD board approves of it I then make that an item of the agenda of the DD/I board, and we resolve it at that board meeting. Similarly, I feel that the DD/P should have a board consisting of its sub-board chairmen; and the same with DD/A. Then take the DD/I area, with which I am familiar, say every office in DD/I wants to send somebody overseas. Maybe you want to send two or three, --I mean for special rotation. All of those would float up to the DD/I Board. The DD/I board would say, "This year we can only rotate four people from DD/I to DD/A." Then that board would determine whether it would be the OCD candidate or the OO candidate or the OSI candidate or the ORR candidate. Then they would make their decision and it would approach the DD/A board in that manner. This board would probably have a sub-board which would be the overall operating, governing board for the day-to-day operations, not for policy. That way I think we could get action on these things. There would be some means of implementing these plans if the plans are valid.

The other thing that I have is this: Should all this be done in an evolutionary manner? I think the existing boards can be used. I don't think we ought to disrupt this whole thing. We have just barely gotten this balloon off the ground, and now I think we have to make it work. I think we should investigate the rotation and the training for our junior executives. I think we should take it slow and easy, let's say rotating out of one major complex to another at the rate, this first year, of 10 or 15 at the most. If it is successful, and as we develop experience and as we develop know-how and we know the pitfalls to avoid, if we want to step up the program we step it up, but I think it should be done on a gradual basis. We can eventually make the thing work. I think a lot of our employees have the idea that rotation means that everybody gets on the merry-go-round. I don't think that would work. I think it could be started on a very small basis, and I would so recommend. Insofar as whether or not it is feasible to rotate people, I'd like to show some figures here. In the past 3 years OCD has transferred   <sup>25X1A</sup> to the DD/P area. Therefore, it seems as though employees of the so-called overt side can be used in the covert side.

SECRET

SECRET

25X9

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask a question, Jean. Would you take all

25X1A

I would take most of them.

I refuse to answer. I would take most of them, yes.

And, also, in that same three-year period we transferred 78 people to other offices, DD/A, and other offices within DD/A. Now these were straight out and out transfers. This does not mean our people are unhappy or have low morale.

25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What about the flow?

What is the reverse coming into you from other places? I would say, as an off-hand guess, probably about the same. I don't have the figures here. Probably not quite as high from DD/P to us but it does exist.

Now, as I was going to say here, this does not reflect unhappy employees and low morale in OCD. It's simply that OCD is a wonderful spot for a person to come into the Agency to get basic, fundamental background, and we feel that anybody we take and then they go on to greener pastures, so much the better - and I wouldn't deny their transfers. Also, we must admit that many people come into this Agency without knowing just what they are getting into, and the minute they find out they are in OCD and they are a humdrum librarian with no possible chance of going overseas, they become slightly, oh, shall I say "restless" and try to see if there isn't some way they could get into an outfit that may result in an overseas assignment. Were we to offer a good rotation plan a lot of these people would never have left us. They would have gone on a rotation to overseas and then they would be happy to come back. So that is another benefit that would be derived from rotation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would you say a couple of more words on your career planning? You said 24 were done. Were they done by the individuals themselves? Were they the ones that suggested this was the type of career they wanted?

25X1A

This is the way we went about it. We asked the Division Chief to select the two or three juniors with the greatest potential. Then the Division Chief, together with the individual sat down and worked up a career development. In other words, he was not left to himself, yet his wishes in the matter and his possible ambitions and possible abilities were taken into account. It was a joint effort by the Division Chief with the individual, and then submitted

SECRET

to the board, which is all of the Division Chiefs and myself, and we reviewed these and we just have them on file. The Division Chief is responsible for following up on these plans and for putting forward recommendations for training, for rotation and so forth to the OCD board. In other words, the Division Chief then takes a personal interest in these two or three people and he will come to the board next month and say, "I would like to have him go to Georgetown this year," and so on. In other words, he keeps track. He has the progress chart, as it were, of those he has selected.

25X1A [ ] He follows the plan that has been reviewed and approved by the Board, however.

25X1A [ ] Yes, he executes, however. Now the plans are not inflexible, they are very flexible. Also, those individuals that were originally chosen may be dropped at any given time if the Division Chief or the board should change its mind and decide to sponsor some other candidate instead of the one that was originally proposed.


. . . Mr. Sheldon joined the meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You mentioned in [ ] plan possible service<sup>25X1A</sup> in other Government agencies? Was that a part of many of the plans? Because I don't think it is terribly practical except in rare instances.

25X1A [ ] No, I doubt if that appeared in more than two out<sup>25X1A</sup> of the 24 or 25.

of loading additional personnel in. But I think, again, it gets to be a question of quantity. You can judge this only when you know how many people you are talking about per year or per period, whatever it may be.

25X1A

~~SECRET~~

25X1A

[redacted] Only we suggested here on a peripheral reporting post. But everything I said I would like to have considered in the light of a very minimum beginning. We have only pushed one of the 24 cases thinking that if we could ever get our foot in the door and get a program started or a program accepted in theory, perhaps then we could move on to two, three, or four more.

The other thing that I think happens today is that all of the 20 some odd boards function in an entirely different manner, and think they have different types of responsibilities.

25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We joined that issue last week, and [redacted] is charged at the moment with the responsibility of coming up, for this Board, with a list of the major differences that exist, so that we can lay down a formula for the boards to operate on which will standardize board procedure.

25X1A

[redacted] I was thinking if you had a DD/I board consisting of the chairmen of our eight boards, you would--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is a technique to accomplish it.

25X1A

[redacted] That would help to standardize the operation of all those boards.

25X1A

[redacted] The point of the number of these boards has been the cause of a great deal of misunderstanding and dismay. There has been the thought that we would set up five boards to give individual attention to [redacted] Obviously that is impossible, and I don't think it has ever been the intention of anybody to do it that way.

25X9

. . . Mr. White was called from the meeting . . .

25X1A

[redacted] It should be understood, however you set these up there would have to be enough sub-boards or panels or mechanisms so that you can, at a supervisory level, study these things and submit to the top boards only matters of policy or matters involving clearly senior people who would come to the attention of the members of these top boards in any event. I think there has been a boogeyman in this whole business of merging career service, and rather an unnecessary one,

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

because it couldn't work and there has been no intention of working it that way or trying to work it that way.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any more questions for [ ] because I 25X1A  
want to skip on the agenda to item 4, in view of the fact that that ties in very  
directly with what we have been talking about. And, [ ] I hope you will stay, 25X1A  
if you would like to, to hear the rest of the meeting.

Harry?

MR. REYNOLDS: The first item in 4 concerns the paper which will be  
circulated in the Office of Personnel asking each person to fill out their own  
thoughts about what they want to do, - a career plan. I am informed that other  
offices have a similar questionnaire. I have copies of our plan here to submit to  
other offices to tie it in with theirs, with the thought that the Executive Secre-  
tary will use that as an overall questionnaire which could be used by the entire  
personnel of the Agency in giving their answers.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would certainly be in favor of a standard  
questionnaire to be used by all office boards so that when correlation takes place  
and you get into this matter of rotation you don't have to do the job half over  
again.

25X1A [ ] Are you going to give this questionnaire to every in-  
dividual? Because then there is a presumption that you are going to do something  
about it. I think that is a dangerous thing to start doing.

MR. REYNOLDS: I don't think we should. We should possibly do it on  
a sampling basis.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would think so. I would think OCD's technique  
of taking two or three of the top juniors in each Division or Branch, and using  
them as samples, with a covering statement to the effect that this is an explora-  
tory sampling technique, and that rotation is for a very small percentage. Because  
I think we must take concerted and strong action to kill the belief around here  
that this is going to be an Agency of whirling dervishes around here, that every-  
body is rotating simultaneously.

25X1A [ ] That is what bothered me. I think it would be very  
dangerous.  
[ ] That had been discussed but I don't think the Personnel  
Career Service Board made a final decision on that. I suggested to Mr. Reynolds  
that in connection with this survey which I am about to launch on a common



Approved For Release 2002/05/10 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500010018-8

~~SECRET~~

denominator procedure, that I could also do this and find, for the consideration of this Board, perhaps a formula or common denominator for a questionnaire, by drawing together the Security Office Career Development Plan procedure and others.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think without in any way stultifying or negating the initiative taken by the boards, that if you can do that and we can get a standard form and a genuine understanding of how this is to be used so that we don't start a false rumor going around that everybody is going to get into this, that it would be worth doing. It might be done simultaneously, with item 3 on the agenda, which we will get to later.

SECRET

separate mechanism, could, I think, without changing the existing system very markedly, be put into effect through an expansion--an expansion in time rather than in bodies--of the JOT program. We are taking into the JOT program an increasing number of Agency employees; that is, people who have come into the program from the Agency--particularly after the ceiling hit we uncovered a lot of pretty good people who were without jobs--and I would like to have the Board consider that as an alternative to this proposal.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think in view of the fact that quite a lot of you haven't had the opportunity to thoroughly get into this, including the fact that a very complete mechanism is herewith proposed, that if it is agreeable to the Board we should carry this particular item over to the next meeting.

MR. WISNER: I am very much in favor of that. Both  and I have read this very hastily, and whereas there are some points we have already spotted that we would like to question or challenge, we are not ready to come up with our final statement of views.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think in considering it, that each of the Deputy Directors and AD/Personnel, AD/Training and AD/Commo should also consider the fact that, just speaking from what I have seen of the Director's view on the ceiling, I don't think there is any possibility--not even the vaguest--that he would increase the ceiling. Approved For Release 2002/05/10 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500010018-8

adopted would have to come from the body politic.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, shall we proceed to item 3 on the agenda, which is the piece de resistance today.

MR. WHITE: Has the Staff Study been postponed for future consideration?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is what we are now getting to. I simply--which is my usual procedure--switched items on the agenda. We took up item 4 before 3.

I think that is a very interesting Staff Study the Office of Personnel has prepared, but inasmuch as I was the one that originally suggested the 120 figure idea, to get started, and also suggested that the Personnel Office start to work out something--which I think we have a very good start on--I would like to point out one major area where I disagree with it. In the first place, I feel very strongly that, if we are going to start a rotation system in which we all believe, the slots with which to start that rotation system should come out of the existing slots of the offices participating. Because by the very nature of rotation, if DD/P rotates 20 people out of the DD/P area into the other areas, it would be assumed, the way I envisaged the system working, that DD/P would gain 20 people, and that there would always be a counter-balancing. Furthermore, I think if this is a gravy train, inasmuch as it is not going to cost an office anything, then it's going to get off to the wrong start at the very beginning. So I would recommend at the very initial start that the 120 slots, rather than coming from an increase in the Agency ceiling, come on a pro-rated basis out of the existing components. I think the way I just casually mentioned it was, say 30 slots from each of the three major components, and 10 from Training and from Commo. Now that could be varied.

25X1A  If you do it that way then when your man returns to you the slot which he goes back to is vacated.

SECRET

25X1A

[ ] I don't think that is the kind of rotation we are talking about. The man may never come back to you. He may find a role in which he is more valuable to the Agency than he was in the office he left. This is not a training program per se, for the individual. He has to be productive as well as getting his training, and therefore he shouldn't be a supernumerary.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If he isn't productive then rotation is no good, because we don't put them in slots to simply view the scene.

25X1A

[ ] It would probably be a year before he would be productive, and I would say it could last over a period of ten years if he is growing all the time.

MR. REYNOLDS: Presumably you get a man back in place of the one you had lost.

25X1A

[ ] Either from Commo or from recruiting. I would assume the man I let go for this program would probably never come back to me.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Say you move 10 slots, but there will be 10 persons from the Agency in your slots all the time.

MR. BAIRD: I don't think it would work that way.

25X1A

[ ] No, because I probably couldn't absorb 10 non-communications people in the limited ceiling that I have. I don't think we should shoot for a goal of 120 -- I should think what Mr. Reynolds has said, not to exceed one percent of his component strength. This won't go unless you have a management that is extremely stubborn and also pliable, and is bought by all the components as something that is good for the Agency. In that case let the numbers turn out to be realistic ones.

25X1A

[ ] Would you start with 120 and keep filling the gaps?

MR. REYNOLDS: I visualize filling the gaps as they drop out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Like Career Development Slots.

25X1A

[ ] Because on an attrition basis you will lose 15 or 20 of them.

[ ] These would be like Career Development Slots, over and above the T/O of the office.

MR. WHITE: May I make a comment on that, Kirk?

First of all, I agree with you that I would not recommend to the Director--and I don't think it would do any good if you did--that he increase the personnel ceiling by 120 positions, because he talks, two, three or four times

SECRET

SECRET

a week about making it less than it is now. So whatever we do I think we have to do within our present personnel ceiling. Maybe I have a peculiar situation - I don't know. Obviously I would be happy to have all administrative officers in the Agency also be fine intelligence officers, but I would first like them to be good administrative officers. I am not sure we have even reached a satisfactory situation as far as having a good professional corps of administrative officers yet. So if we are talking about rotation among the various Agency components to develop a professional corps of administrative officers that I am interested in, we are doing this right now in the administrative field between the cooperation that now exists between DD/P and DD/A, and to a far greater extent than is envisaged here. If this is rotation from the DD/A component to the DD/P component in the administrative field, finance, and the rest of it, we are way ahead of this. Frankly, I wouldn't want to give up 10 or 20, or whatever number of slots you think DD/A should give up, in addition to what we are already doing, which I think is a good and a very effective program in the administrative field.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But this, as we envisaged it, and as we mentioned it when we suggested this plan be developed, was to take 10 or 20 of your GS-5's through 11's who look like they are broader than just administrators, that they are going up to an executive job at some date five or ten years in the future, and getting them into the rotation system, as pointed out here, is one way to develop them as junior executives. And when they move into this Selective Rotation Program then they are moving into the candidacy for the Junior Executive Inventory.

MR. WHITE: But if you feel a man to be in the Junior Executive Inventory has to have administrative experience and intelligence experience--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not necessarily, but I think this is one way to give an opportunity to 120, or any figure you want to pick right across the board of the junior executives that we want to broaden enough so when they get up into this building they have had a broad cross-experience in the Agency.

MR. WHITE: I quite agree. But let's take the grade 9 finance officer, for instance, who has had 2 or 3 years' experience in Ed Saunders' office, and then he goes to maybe an 11 finance officer in the DD/P area, and he follows that as a general administrative officer in an overseas station. Certainly some of the operational and intelligence stuff is rubbed off in that period of time. So I would consider him as having had experience which would qualify him as a junior executive just as much and maybe even a little more so than I would if he

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

had gone completely out of the administrative field during that period and become an intelligence officer.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why isn't what you say perfectly consonant with this? The fact that we have a rotation plan doesn't mean that he has to go to every office in the Agency - he can have a very selected rotation to specific offices. You wouldn't take the best operator Frank has and move him through every office, but he might broaden himself very much if, say, he got into Current Intelligence, for instance, because it gave him a field to show him what he was fighting for. And he might move over to OCI for say a year's tour, and then right back.

MR. WHITE: I'm not fighting the problem except I think the DD/I area, of course, is not participating in this at all right at the moment, but insofar as cross-fertilization between the DD/A and the DD/P, which is where the bulk of our administrative people are anyway, I think we are accomplishing that right now, and I think we can continue to accomplish that within present ceilings and without quotas. We have people who are intelligent, operational people that are nominated for administrative jobs all the time, and we select them sometimes to go into administrative jobs. And administrative people are going out the other way. I frankly don't think taking 20 positions away from DD/A to accomplish this, is going to help DD/A or the overall program insofar as we are concerned, very much.

25X1A

[ ] They are 20 bodies - not positions, Red.

MR. WHITE: I think we are doing that already.

MR. REYNOLDS: What Red says of DD/P is true of AD/P. Insofar as DD/P is concerned we have over 60 trained personnel officers now working in the DD/P complex. I can think of three of those men right now whose value would be enhanced if they had other Agency experience than just personnel, and they would do an excellent job in OOC - one of them I know, anyway, who is a highly personable fellow and an excellent man for any field office.

25X1A

[ ] I thought what we were trying to accomplish here was grooming people to take the places of those who pass on, whereas the finance man and the administrative man are specialized. Administrative people are detailed to these other offices, and finance people are detailed to these other offices, but when you find any one of those people that looks like he could be developed into something less specialized than finance or administration, then those are the people I thought we were talking about that we were grooming for

~~SECRET~~



SECRET

other than specialized jobs.

MR. BAIRD: I'm afraid that we are trying to make generals too quickly. I haven't heard anybody say how long a period of specialization these young men are going to have, but I think it should be a considerable period of specialization - I mean, the process of the specialization, if it has been identified. If they have, in addition to their specialty, executive and administrative ability, then they are the ones that should be identified and broadened. But I am afraid we are still talking about too many people needing rotation, and I don't think they do.

MR. WHITE: I started out by saying that I think we are quite a ways from doing our job in the administrative field without taking on the additional obligation to make everybody a professional case officer.

MR. BAIRD: The other thing that worries me, Kirk, is that Frank's side of the shop, as far as I can make out--I've just come back from talking to the Navy about how tight they are on slots, and we are going to have to wipe out that OCS program as far as the Navy is concerned, and we are going to find it increasingly difficult to actually find places to send people overseas. Frank hasn't enough places to send his own people overseas. He has more people than he can take care of and fewer places to put them. I don't know what happens to these 24 that want overseas rotation. I think one of the reasons no action has been taken is that there are no spots for them. We have people in the Office of Training that came from the DD/P 3 or 4 years ago and who expect to be taken back into the DD/P and should be taken back, but there are no places for them - and they are good people. I think we ought to go much more slowly than we are talking today. If Red knows of a young man or young woman, then let him come up with that young man and say, "Here is somebody I think we ought to do something about," and not say, "Here, you have 10 slots to do this, or 20 slots to do that."

MR. WHITE: When we were looking for an administrative officer in say an 11 or 12, we asked not only the area Divisions but also the area components to submit a nomination, and we usually ended up with quite a few people from both sides of the house to select from. So we do take specialists out of their specialized field and put them into general administration all along. I am sure if you looked over the records for the last year or two, three or four, you would find quite a number of those people have gone from the administrative game into operations of one kind or another. Insofar as we are concerned in the administrative

SECRET

SECRET

field, I'm not sure that we aren't doing a lot of this now. Now that doesn't solve the cross-fertilization between the DD/I and the DD/P. But I don't think I have the same problem.

25X1A [ ] Mr. Chairman, may I make the remark that it seems to me what you are actually doing, you are really transferring people. This would permit you to do the same thing but instead of calling it a transfer you call it a rotation. Isn't that what this paper says?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In effect, yes.

25X1A [ ] And it would permit more rotation. In other words, it wouldn't prevent you from doing exactly what you are doing now except put a different label on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I can't quite honestly say whether I think it is a rose by any other name, because, as [ ] points out, some of the people in this system will not return to you ultimately. The same is true of what you are doing today, Red. What you actually do, in effect, is to transfer permanently. They may come back to you and then again they may not.

25X1A

25X1A [ ] Isn't the essential difference that in this proposed system there would be a longer-range plan formulated and watched over, whereas under our present system there is no long-range plan but there is the immediate transfer action, and there is no particular looking beyond the job or assignment into which the man is transferred. I think that is one of the essential differences. In other words, the combination of what OCD has done with respect to 24 people, and what you in the DD/A are doing, Red, to such a great extent. The plan proposed by the Office of Personnel - a combination of those two is, to me, what we are looking for.

25X1A [ ] The general plan is that you expect them to come back?  
As a matter of fact, I do not necessarily expect them back. They may effect a permanent transfer any place along the line, but the point is they have a home to return to at any given point, if the plan doesn't work out, and someone is responsible for them - that's the reason for that.

25X1A [ ] In a one or two-year rotation they wouldn't be too rich to take back.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not in grades 5 to 11. That's not going to out-price them.

25X1A [ ] But coming back as 13's, say, after five years--

SECRET

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We assume, at least I would assume, that proportionate numbers would be under 11's, but by the time they get to the 11 grade they are moving up to an assistant branch chief.

MR. WHITE: I don't mean that I am opposed to the plan in any way.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It didn't sound exactly like you were very much in favor of it, Red. (Laughter)

MR. WHITE: I'm not willing, at least, to contribute 20 slots to develop intelligence officers. I will contribute 50 if it is confined to rotation of administrative personnel around, or any other number, so long as they come under the jurisdiction of the various administrative boards.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Isn't that the administration of the plan per se, rather than the theory of it?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

25X1A

I don't see where you are giving up positions. You are rotating 20 bodies out of 20 positions but you are getting 20 bodies back.

MR. WHITE: Maybe I'm not clear, but we are hard put at the moment to come up with all the administrative needs that we have to meet the DD/P's needs both here and overseas, and I'm not at the moment prepared to say that I will throw 20 of those people, which are already in short supply, into intelligence officer slots. That is exactly what I meant to say.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't believe that was the concept, necessarily, except you might have one or two who might want to be intelligence officers rather than logistics officers.

MR. WHITE: Yes, but I don't want to be told that, "You will take 20 people and they are good people, and put them over to take intelligence training," when I am having a hard time trying to find enough good ones to do the administrative work.

MR. WISNER: I am pretty ignorant about this, not knowing the background here, but doesn't this plan contemplate that even though you have it launched on anything like the broad principles stated here, it would still very definitely require and take into account the need for tailoring each particular case according to its own merits and precisely according to what you are trying to do with the individual? And wouldn't that perhaps supply the answer to your question, Red? I mean, you aren't just giving away the whole hand on a thing like this. All you are doing is saying we are going to consider this, and each case we are

SECRET

SECRET

going to study and try to hand-fashion the rotation program for this particular individual. Isn't that what is contemplated here in this thing?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually, in effect, this is an expansion of the Junior Officer Trainee System. You have a larger group of grades and existing Agency employees not recruited for this particular purpose but having come aboard have indicated a desire to make a career in the Agency and who have broadened their base.

25X1A  And have shown outstanding potential.

MR. WHITE: But in effect, I say as between the DD/A and the DD/P they are more than doing that now. I think I am right in saying that between the Office of Training and DD/P they are probably doing at least this much. Isn't your issue really how to get cross-fertilization between your intelligence officer in DD/I and DD/P?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not necessarily. I think the basic issue is to provide a mechanism where your junior officer who has ambitions and desires and capabilities can go into a system where there is this ability to broaden his base.

Let me throw a question back at you. Are you in favor of this plan as presented?

MR. WHITE: Frankly, I haven't read it. It was delivered to my office about 30 minutes before I came to this meeting.

25X1A  I think one point has been missed here. Colonel White is talking about his responsibility to service all components with administrative, and Mr. Reynolds with personnel people. That isn't what my concept of this rotation is. My concept would be when you furnish an administrative man in the DD/P area and he becomes interested in that type of work, then when you look him over and see he might be in the area of the Division Chief some day, then you've got him. But what you are doing, you are detailing people (indicating Mr. White). That is not my conception of this type of rotation where we are grooming people to be sufficiently broad so that maybe they would be a DD/A some day, in which his knowledge of all of the appropriate parts of the Agency would make him a better DD/A.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In all fairness, I think we are pushing this discussion pretty far for a plan that has been in your hands only a few hours.

MR. BAIRD: I got the plan at 8:30 this morning and I have read it once. I would like to amplify what you said, Kirk. What is suggested here as a

SECRET

NOTE: Attached pages 13-18, incl., were excerpted from 22d Meeting  
of CIA Career Service Board, 18 Feb 1954, because of references  
made herein to "ROTATION"

25X1A



MR. SHELDON: K , isn't there a factor here which perhaps isn't reflected? What we lack, I think, in this structure, is a negotiating mechanism as between fundamentally the six components - in other words, DD/P, DD/A, DD/I, Training, Commo and Personnel. What we need is a negotiating mechanism.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is this Board?

MR. SHELDON: You don't sit on individual cases, though. This Board sets the policy with respect to career development.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me that one objective we ought to have in working this out is not to create anything that doesn't have to be created.

MR. SHELDON: I agree with that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Anything in the nature of a board, a panel, a committee, and so forth. But to see if we don't have existing within the Agency today, that mechanism, and doesn't that mechanism either exist in inter-board relationships or in the Personnel Office? Or shouldn't it?

MR. SHELDON: I don't see any negotiating mechanism today which is being effective to create these openings for various individuals in the various offices.

25X1A  There is in some cases between the boards. We have been doing it with ORR, etc.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But didn't we agree at the last meeting that rotation per se is for a very small minority, and the way we would get into that would be through the direction of these 120 slots which Personnel will come up with within a matter of days.

MR. SHELDON: Will that be sufficient to undertake the movement between various components?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My reaction would be that is the best way to start it and see what progresses.



SECRET

MR. REYNOLDS: Kirk, that paper will be dittoed and in everybody's hands on Monday for them to shoot at to look at these 120 that we presume we will pick out from our various components. I think it's a perfectly good starting place.

The other thing that I would like to put on the record is the impression which I gained in the two days of briefing by the DD/P complex which was summed up, I thought very succinctly, by [ ] in his final statement yesterday, and this is almost an exact quote: The career service program is of great importance. It is gaining in usefulness and importance for the DD/P complex. I would not like to see any drastic change made at this time. The boards are doing a very good job in our own area and they are well integrated, one with the other. 25X1A

I don't know whether that would fit in with Dick and John's general comments.

25X1A [ ] It doesn't with my function, to put it very straightforward -- there is still some disagreement.

MR. REYNOLDS: In any event, I have not had the opportunity to have the same broad picture of the DD/I side that I have of the DD/P side. But that was of particular interest to me because it was an expression from each one of the Division staff heads as to what the career service meant in their own unit. And there was very little sniping at it, I thought. They had suggestions and thoughts as far as they affected the Office of Personnel, but generally speaking it was an acceptance of what has been done already and a feeling that more could be done in the future under the framework which already exists.

25X1A [ ] Kirk, can't we say in there we want to continue the office boards for the time being and give consideration to the fact that eventually they should be supplanted by major component boards?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is the sense of the meeting.

25X1A [ ] Are you taking care of me, Dick, from now on?  
[ ] wasn't aware of it.  
[ ] thought that was raised at the last meeting.  
[ ] It was, and also whether communications people should  
25X1A come under [ ]

MR. WHITE: The first and immediate step is to standardize the procedures of the present boards. It must seem a little ridiculous, say to

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A

[ ] to have a Security, an FI man and a DD/P man, who are all three under different career service systems. I think that would be a big step, to try to standardize those procedures -- something like the length of overseas tours and whether or not a fellow will be extended, promotion policies, and a lot of other things, so that at an overseas post a senior representative has one set of standards for all his people, instead of twenty.

MR. BAIRD: Red, I think that is what has been hoped from us for two and a half years, that there be an Agency policy so that the office boards could make their own policy that wouldn't be at odds with the Agency policy. But they could not or did not wait for us to do that and they have gone ahead on their own, but they will retrench and retract if there is an Agency policy established on these things. I thought there was on length of overseas tours. I know there hasn't been on promotions. I wasn't aware there had been so many things the office boards had been doing that were at odds with each other.

MR. WHITE: I have had several. Each one of my offices are in a different business, so in some cases their stand is justified. But I think we are making some progress.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right, we agree it should be done. Now, who is going to do it?

MR. WHITE: I think the only place it can be done is right here. I can do it for my own boards through my own office, and I do, when something comes to my attention that isn't right, I do say that everybody will conform to this in the future. But I can't do it for anybody else.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Suppose we instruct the Executive Secretary to canvass the different boards and indicate to us the areas in which there is nonconformance to a standard pattern, so that we can find out where the variation in the pattern is and lay down a basic policy?

25X1A

[ ] I'll accept that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am just trying to do what we want to do. Let's do that. I couldn't agree with you more. Take promotion, for example - the periods of time for consideration for promotion.

25X1A

[ ] From my peregrinations among these boards I think there are certain very large areas in which the pattern is pretty standard; but there are other areas in which there is not conformation, and as soon as those are brought to this board the board can say how they want it to be.

25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We have a book of regulations in which the [ ] series is on personnel, I believe. It seems to me you could supplement that with a series of career service procedures and supply those to everybody and make sure they all use them.

25X1A

[ ] You already have mine.

MR. BAIRD: There was a phrase used, Kirk, two and a half years ago about making this place a better place in which to work, and I think you will find the boards have been trying to do that and they aren't very far apart in the methods they have exercised.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we would accomplish a great deal. And as a rider on that same Bill, I would say, including a look to see how much we can simplify and eliminate the paper work required of the boards. That is a factor which worries me.

MR. WHITE: I don't waste much time on that, but I do feel our individual boards are making a genuine effort to instill career service into peoples' minds all over. And in our area, particularly this idea of everybody having to take overseas service, has been thrown pretty hard. As a matter of fact, we have given some people the gate when they said they wouldn't go overseas. We have said, "You better get your hat and leave if you don't want to go overseas." We have different situations from other people, but we are working pretty hard on that. Also, on this other business--I know that we in the DD/A area look worse than anybody if you interpret the lack of use of rotation loan slots as a lack of interest in career service, but I would say in the past year we have put over 200 people from central administrative offices into other components.

25X1A

[ ] Which is a kind of rotation.

MR. WHITE: Yes, and which to my mind is a far greater showing than the use of five or six rotation loan slots some place. I think you will find people are really interested in this thing and they are just looking for guidance.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's go to paragraph 4b. - the number of career designations should be reduced from 26 to 5. Harry?

MR. REYNOLDS: I can't see--if this plan of 120 works--that each one of those young men, after having completed his rotation, isn't going to have six career designations. [ ] brought up the last time the

25X1A

SECRET

comparison with the Army career activity in which you get a series of MOS's, as you go on to Ft. Leavenworth or to Ft. Sill, but the primary MOS is the one in which you finally settle. It seems to me we can't avoid a well-rounded man in this career service who hasn't got a number of career designations. I think we should point toward that rather than just toward one.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, is it practical to change the career designations at the present time if we are going to leave the office boards?

MR. REYNOLDS: I think if you leave a man in his basic MOS--if you call it that for want of a better name, until we settle on our own name--and if he gets other skills his charm and attractiveness is enhanced to the next office that wants to take him over. Or say that in the course of his gyrations through



think that is what we are looking for.

25X1A

[redacted] And he is there because he primarily wants to be there and he is acceptable to [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A

[redacted] And the third thing is that his assignment is best for the Agency.

MR. REYNOLDS: I think that is one of the things we can pin on as a proper method of what Matt has called the Agency being the best place to work that the fellow knows of.


25X1A

[redacted] And he also has the discipline to know maybe he isn't getting exactly what he wants, but he is willing to do it because a responsible body, or board, or entity in the Agency has said: "This is the best thing for you to do for the Government. Therefore, you have this assignment."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But we weren't talking about the practical problem of career designations, we were talking about a man's career without the designation of FI or NE - because to my mind the peak of absurdity is to have the NE designation. They are basically intelligence analysts, so that really there is a much larger designation there. Here, again, I go back to the simple elimination of nationality by virtue of a career designation. So in order to reconcile it I would like to tie it to the preceding paragraph and say that study should be given to reducing the number of career designations as the office boards may yield to component boards.

SECRET

25X1A



Isn't that the only reason for the designations, to tell what board he is under?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It is an administrative device. But one of the things about career designations that gives me cold shudders in the deep of the night is to think of the amount of paper work that goes in for people with career designations and at least every hour one person is changing his career designation. So you can see what a tremendous amount of paper work is involved for career designations.

25X9

MR. BAIRD: They don't change unless there is a transfer.

25X1A



When the personnel action goes forward the career designation changes simultaneously.

25X1A



But they call every time from Personnel and ask. I think it should be an automatic thing, if somebody is accepting a person on a transfer they should change the designation automatically.

25X1A



Mr. Reynolds, I suggest we take a look at that and see if we can't simplify the paper work on the change of designations.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In addition to my previous recommendation that this be tied into the recommendation on office boards, I think if the Personnel Office could come up with some recommendation on the subject for the board to consider, it would be very useful.

Going on to paragraph 4.c. - career development. I feel quite strongly as to the importance of planning careers on some basis more or less over a period of time so that we can get away from the employees feeling--and this relates, I think, most directly to the DD/P area--that they don't know where their next assignment is going to be. In other words, I would like to see everybody overseas knowing that when he comes back he has either assignment A, B or C. I would like to see everybody in Training knowing when he returns he has assignment A, B or C. That particularly applies to the external training people sent to the defense schools, to know that when they come back they have assignment A, B or C.

SECRET